



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/000,294	12/04/2001	Cheng-Shing Lai	3313-0438P-SP	8941

2292 7590 05/09/2005

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

SHARMA, SUJATHA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2684

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/000,294

Applicant(s)

LAI ET AL.

Examiner

Sujatha Sharma

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen [US 2003/0038786] in view of Kishimoto [US 2002/0094846].

Regarding claim 1, Nguyen discloses a handheld computer having moveable segments that are interactive with integrated display. Nguyen further discloses: a protective cover, with a window opening, connected to the PDA body for sliding relative to the PDA body to a first position for completely exposing the display panel and to a second position for covering the display panel with exposing part of the display panel corresponding to the window opening, a surface of the protective cover having a plurality of function keys. See Figs. 1,2 18-22, page 1, paragraphs 10-14; pages 2,3, paragraphs 47-52, pages 7,8, paragraphs 113-129.

Nguyen further discloses an actuating mechanism that is sued for selection of displayed data. See page 3, paragraphs 61,62.

However, he does not specifically disclose method wherein the PDA body has a picture switching switch and the picture switching switch is pressed in the second position to make the display panel display only pictures relevant to cellular phone functions in an area seen through

Art Unit: 2684

the window opening and is released in the first position to let the display panel show a picture relevant to the functions of PDA.

Kishimoto, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a portable information apparatus with a switching switch and the picture switching switch is pressed in the second position to make the display panel display only pictures relevant to cellular phone functions in an area seen through the window opening and is released in the first position to let the display panel show a picture relevant to the functions of PDA. See page 6, paragraphs 87-89.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Kishimoto to Nguyen in order to reduce the electricity consumption of the portable device.

Regarding claim 2, Nguyen further discloses a PDA wherein the PDA body and the protective cover respectively have sliding groove and a locking hook and change relative position by the sliding groove and the locking hook sliding on each other. See pages 5,6 paragraphs 95-100.

Regarding claims 3,5 Nguyen further discloses the PDA wherein the PDA body has a blocker for preventing the locking hook from breaking away from the sliding groove in the first position. See pages 5,6 paragraphs 95-100.

Regarding claim 7, Nguyen discloses a PDA wherein the PDA body has a hole for fitting the display panel and the display panel has a raising rim coupled with the window opening for

Art Unit: 2684

forming a tiny display window in the second position. See Figs. 18-22 and page 7, paragraphs 114-122.

3. Claims 4,6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen [US 2003/0038786] and Kishimoto [US 2002/0094846] in view of Headon [US 6,324,386].

Regarding claims 4,6, Nguyen discloses all the limitations as discussed in treating claim

1. However he fails to disclose a method wherein the blocker is flexible.

Headon, in the same filed of endeavor, teaches a mobile phone having foldable cover. He further teaches a method where in the blocker for preventing the locking hook from breaking away from the sliding groove in the first position is a flexible blocker. See col. 4, lines 1-11 and col. 5, lines 24-27.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Headon to modified Nguyen in order to open and close the cover for the phone/PD device with ease and provide the device with a less substantial hinge mechanism.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen [US 2003/0038786] and Kishimoto [US 2002/0094846] in view of Barnett [US 6,771,939].

Regarding claim 9, Nguyen discloses all the limitations as treated in claim 1. However, he does not specifically disclose a method wherein the PDA body and the protective cover respectively have an electric induction plate connected to the internal circuit of the PDA body and a sliding conductor used to connect the functional keys so that the function keys is used to perform operations and executions through the connection and conduction between the electric

Art Unit: 2684

induction plate and the function keys whenever the protective cover installed on the PDA body and slides relative to the PDA body.

Barnett, in the same filed of endeavor, teaches a PDA wherein the PDA body and the protective cover respectively have an electric induction plate connected to the internal circuit of the PDA body and a sliding conductor used to connect the functional keys so that the function keys is used to perform operations and executions through the connection and conduction between the electric induction plate and the function keys whenever the protective cover installed on the PDA body and slides relative to the PDA body. See col. 3, lines 31-63.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Barnett to modified Nguyen in order for proper functioning of the hand-held device with a sliding cover.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7,9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Pirila [US 2003/0068035]

User changeable electronic device/mobile phone covers and method

Vooi-Kia [US 2003/0003962]

Automatic sliding mechanism for portable electronic product particularly for s sliding front cover of a mobile phone

Art Unit: 2684


Innoue [US 6,643,529]

Portable radio device

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sujatha Sharma whose telephone number is 571-272-7886. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7.30am - 4.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sujatha Sharma
April 26, 2005


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER